

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SAMUEL B JOHNSON III,

Case No. C-07-05756 SI (JCS)

Plaintiff(s),

v.

CHEVRON CORPORATION, ET AL.,

**ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND  
DENYING IN PART DEFENDANTS'  
MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER  
[Docket No. 101]**

Defendant(s).

Defendants Chevron Corporation and the Chevron Environmental Management Company ("Chevron") filed a letter brief on August 4, 2008. (Docket No. 101). Plaintiff replied on August 11, 2008. (Docket No. 107). For the reasons stated below, the Court treats Chevron's letter as a motion for a protective order, and grants the motion in part and denies the motion in part.

Plaintiff served one set of Requests for Admission on each Defendant. Each set contained 30 requests for admission. Defendants responded. Subsequently, Plaintiff served nine (9) more sets of Requests for Admission, totaling 226 additional Requests for Admission addressed to each defendant. In this simple case, Plaintiff has not provided any information which would justify serving such an extraordinary number of Requests for Admission. The submission of these Requests for Admission is oppressive and unduly burdensome and violates Federal Rules Of Civil Procedure, Rule 26 (c).

Accordingly, the motion is granted in part. Defendants need not respond to the Requests for Admission, sets two through ten, served by Plaintiff. Plaintiff may serve only one further set of

1 Requests for Admission on each Defendant. Each such set shall contain more no more than ten (10)  
2 individual Requests for Admission.

3 IT IS SO ORDERED.

4  
5 Dated: August 14, 2008

6   
7 JOSEPH C. SPERO  
8 United States Magistrate Judge  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28